

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LAWRENCE HOWARD,  
Petitioner,  
v.  
MR. DAVE DAVEY,  
Respondent.

) NO. CV 15-1473-RSWL(E)  
)  
)  
)  
) ORDER OF DISMISSAL  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

On March 2, 2015, Petitioner filed a "Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in State Custody" ("the Petition"). The Petition challenges a criminal judgment in Pomona Superior Court case number KA058224-01 (Petition at 2). Petitioner previously challenged this same criminal judgment in a prior habeas corpus petition filed in this Court. See Howard v. Runnels, CV 05-7403-AHM(E). On August 16, 2006, this Court entered Judgment in Howard v. Runnels, CV 05-7403-AHM(E), denying and dismissing the prior petition on the merits with prejudice.

///

///

1       The Court must dismiss the present Petition in accordance with  
 2 28 U.S.C. section 2244(b) (as amended by the "Antiterrorism and  
 3 Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996"). Section 2244(b) requires that  
 4 a petitioner seeking to file a "second or successive" habeas petition  
 5 first obtain authorization from the Court of Appeals. See Burton v.  
 6 Stewart, 549 U.S. 147, 157 (2007) (where petitioner did not receive  
 7 authorization from Court of Appeals before filing second or successive  
 8 petition, "the District Court was without jurisdiction to entertain  
 9 [the petition]"); Barapind v. Reno, 225 F.3d 1100, 1111 (9th Cir.  
 10 2000) ("the prior-appellate-review mechanism set forth in § 2244(b)  
 11 requires the permission of the court of appeals before 'a second or  
 12 successive habeas application under § 2254' may be commenced"). A  
 13 petition need not be repetitive to be "second or successive," within  
 14 the meaning of 28 U.S.C. section 2244(b). See, e.g., Thompson v.  
 15 Calderon, 151 F.3d 918, 920-21 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 524 U.S. 965  
 16 (1998); Calbert v. Marshall, 2008 WL 649798, at \*2-4 (C.D. Cal.  
 17 Mar. 6, 2008). Petitioner evidently has not yet obtained  
 18 authorization from the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals (see Petition,  
 19 p. 7-8).<sup>1</sup> Consequently, this Court cannot entertain the present  
 20 Petition. See Burton v. Stewart, 549 U.S. at 157; Remsen v. Att'y  
 21 Gen. of Calif., 471 Fed. App'x 571, 571 (9th Cir. 2012) (if a  
 22 petitioner fails to obtain authorization from the Court of Appeals to  
 23 file a second or successive petition, "the district court lacks

---

24  
 25 <sup>1</sup> The Court takes judicial notice of the docket of the  
 26 United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, available  
 27 on the PACER database. See Mir v. Little Company of Mary Hosp.,  
 28 844 F.2d 646, 649 (9th Cir. 1988) (court may take judicial notice  
 of court records). The Ninth Circuit's docket does not show that  
 any individual named Lawrence Howard has obtained any order from  
 the Ninth Circuit permitting the filing of a second or successive  
 habeas petition in this Court.

1 jurisdiction to consider the petition and should dismiss it.")  
2 (citation omitted).  
3

4 For all of the foregoing reasons, the Petition is denied and  
5 dismissed without prejudice.  
6

7 LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.  
8

9 DATED: March 20, 2015.  
10

11 RONALD S.W. LEW

12 \_\_\_\_\_  
RONALD S.W. LEW  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
13

14 PRESENTED this 9th day of  
15 March, 2015, by:  
16

17 \_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
CHARLES F. EICK  
18 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28